

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**AT BECKLEY**

WILLIE QUARTERMAN,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:18-cv-1461

WARDEN D.L. YOUNG,  
FCI BECKLEY,

Respondent.

**ORDER**

Pending are Petitioner Willie Quarterman's *pro se* Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1], filed November 21, 2018, and Respondent Warden D.L. Young's requests for dismissal [Docs. 10, 11, & 15].

This matter was previously referred to the Honorable Cheryl A. Eifert, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Eifert filed her PF&R on March 11, 2020. Magistrate Judge Eifert recommended that the Court deny Mr. Quarterman's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus [Doc. 1], grant Warden D.L. Young's requests for dismissal [Docs. 10, 11, & 15], dismiss this action with prejudice, and remove this matter from the Court's docket.

The Court need not review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations *to which objection is made.*").

(emphasis added). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal the Court's order. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also United States v. De Leon-Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (parties may not typically "appeal a magistrate judge's findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn't require de novo review absent objection."); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party "makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections in this case were due on May 29, 2020. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [**Doc. 18**], **DENIES** Mr. Quarterman's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus [**Doc. 1**], **GRANTS** Warden D.L Young's requests for dismissal [**Docs. 10, 11, & 15**], **DISMISSES** this action with prejudice, and **REMOVES** this matter from the Court's docket.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTERED: June 23, 2020



*Frank W. Volk*  
Frank W. Volk  
United States District Judge